

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Affirmation of the Election

The election made by the undersigned on Applicants' behalf in response to the restriction requirement is hereby confirmed, and the cancellation of claims 1-6 and 11-12 in the present amendment is done to conform to this election. This cancellation is made without prejudice to Applicants' pursuit of these claims in related applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The rejection of claims 7-10 as anticipated by Van Atta (US 5,632,877), Sylvester (US 5,112,470), or Hellman (EP 0 339 975 A2) is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration of these claims is requested. Among the recited limitations of claim 7 and thereby all of claims 7-10 are "a notched member pivotally mounted to said support rack," "a notch to receive an upper edge of said [gel] enclosure," and "an open position in which said notch is raised to release said enclosure," in addition to the various other limitations of the claim. None of these quoted limitations is disclosed in any of the three references.

Van Atta contains no disclosure of a notched member, much less one that is pivotally mounted to any part of the apparatus to receive any part of the gel enclosure or raised to release anything.

Sylvester likewise contains no disclosure of a notched member, and the only pivotally mounted components are upper and lower safety covers 92 (incorrectly labeled in FIG. 2 as 82) and 94, neither of which has a notch that receives the gel enclosure and is raised to release it.

Hellman discloses a structure with rotating clamps but no notched members -- much less any notches to engage or receive the upper edge of the gel enclosure or to be raised to release the enclosure.

With these elements of Applicants' invention missing from all three references, none of the three, either individually or in combination, anticipate Applicants' claims 7-10, and since none of the three contain any suggestion of a notch or any similar structural feature that performs the functions recited in Applicants' claims, none of the three references, either

Application No. 09/696,537, filed October 25, 2000
Examiner: Choi, Ling Siu; Art Unit: 1713
Amendment No. 1 -- Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2004

PATENT

individually or in combination, render Applicants' claims 7-10 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 7-10 meet all requirements of the patent statute and are worthy of allowance. Reconsideration is therefore requested.

Should any matters remain that can be resolved by a conference with Applicants' attorney, the examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Henry Heines
Reg. No. 28,219

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
MHH:mhh
60331503 v1